DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 787 HE 034 007

AUTHOR Gimbert, Belinda G.; Nolan, James F., Jr.
TITLE Team-Based Curriculum Deliberation in a School-University Partnership: How Far Does It Go?
PUB DATE 2001-04-11
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Cooperation; *Curriculum Development; Higher Education; Mentors; *Partnerships in Education; Professional Development; *Professional Development Schools; *Teamwork

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe and assess the collaborative process of curriculum design and implementation that evolved in the context of a school-university partnership. Research questions driving this study were: (1) why do mentor teachers and university faculty in a school-university partnership choose to become involved in a process of developing a classroom learning environment syllabus?; (2) how does this process emerge and become modified?; and (3) what impact does this evolving process have on children, preservice teachers, mentor teachers, and university faculty? The Professional Development School (PDS) classroom learning environment team consisted of 14 members: 2 teacher educators, 11 elementary school mentor teachers from 4 PDS school sites, and a curriculum coordinator. The first part of the paper portrays the contexts of this PDS community. Included in this section are descriptions of the campus-based classroom management syllabus that was taught by a faculty member, and the PDS classroom learning environments syllabus as taught by a team of mentor teachers and university faculty. The second part of the paper describes the process that developed as the university faculty and mentor teachers engaged in curriculum design, co-teaching, and assessment. The final section draws a set of assertions concerning the process and impact of such curriculum generation by a team of university faculty and elementary school teachers. Findings and assertions from this study highlight the contributions that a collaboratively planned and implemented syllabus can make towards the professional development of PDS interns, mentor teachers, and university faculty. The paper also points out important attributes that must be present in the process of curriculum planning to make the collaborative process successful. Appendixes contain syllabi for two PDS intern classes. (Contains 32 references.) (Author/SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 787

Team-based curriculum deliberation in a school-university partnership : How far does it go?

Belinda G. Gimbert

The Pennsylvania State University

bgg111@psu.edu

James F. Nolan, Jr.

The Pennsylvania State University

jimnolan@psu.edu

(Please do not cite as reference without permission from the authors)

B. Gimbert

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper Presentation

The American Educational Research Association

Seattle, 2001

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE034007

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to describe and assess the collaborative process of curriculum design and implementation that evolved in the context of a school-university partnership. The research questions driving this study were: First, why do mentor teachers and university faculty in a school-university partnership chose to become involved in a process of developing a classroom learning environment syllabus? Second, how does this process emerge and modify? And, third, what impact does this evolving process have on children, preservice teachers, mentor teachers, and university faculty? The PDS classroom learning environments team consisted of 14 members: two university-based teacher educators, 11 elementary mentor teachers from the four PDS school sites, and a curriculum coordinator from the school district.

The first part of this paper portrays the context of the particular PDS community in which this process of curriculum deliberation unfolded. Included in this section are descriptions of the campus-based classroom management syllabus that was taught by a faculty member, and the PDS classroom learning environments (CLE) syllabus as taught by a team of mentor teachers and university faculty. The second part of the paper describes the process that developed as the university faculty and mentor teachers engaged in curriculum design, co-teaching, and assessment. The final section draws a set of assertions concerning the process and impact of such curriculum generation by a team of university faculty and elementary school teachers.

Findings and assertions from this study highlight the contributions that a collaboratively planned and implemented syllabus can make towards the professional development of PDS interns, mentor teachers, and university faculty. Further the paper points out important attributes that must be present in the process of curriculum planning to make the collaborative process successful.

Spurred on by recommendations from a plethora of commissions, national reports, and studies of teacher education, school-university partnerships such as the varying models of professional development schools and professional practice schools have been in existence across the United States for about the last ten years (Goodlad, 1990; Holmes, 1986, Holmes, 1990, Levine, 1992). According to Darling Hammond (1994), Professional Development Schools:

> aim to provide new models of teacher education and development by serving as exemplars of practice, builders of knowledge, and vehicles for communicating professional understanding among teacher educators, novices, and veteran teachers. They support the learning of prospective and beginning teachers by creating settings in which novices enter professional practice by working with expert practitioners, enabling veteran teachers to renew their own professional development and assume new roles as mentors, university adjuncts, and teacher leaders. They allow school and university educators to engage jointly in research and rethinking of practice, thus creating an opportunity for the profession to expand its knowledge base by putting research into practice --- and practice into research (p.1).

The vision of such school-university partnerships is based on the assumption that collaborative efforts to prepare new teachers "create learning opportunities that are different from and richer than the opportunities either the school or the university can provide alone" (Cochran-Smith, 1994, p. 149). Collaborative planning and implementation of curriculum in a school-university partnership may facilitate what Cochran-Smith describes as 'collaborative resonance.'

> The goal of teacher educators is not simply to teach students how to teach, but to teach them how to continue learning within diverse school contexts by prolonging and intensifying the influences of university and school, both of which are viewed as potentially liberalizing. (Cochran-Smith, 1994, p. 150)

In her exploration of historical attempts between university faculty and classroom teachers to collaborate, Sandoval (1996) highlights Dewey's suggestion that teachers and university professors collaborate in the University of Chicago lab school (Dewey, 1904). Despite Dewey's advocation that children, teachers, and university faculty have "the potential to be knowledge creators" (Sandoval, 1996, p. 233), the theory-practice gap is a frequently talked about phenomenon in teacher education and school circles. Universities generate knowledge and classroom teachers apply this. Pointedly, Shulman (1987, p. 12) highlighted the significance of collaborating with classroom teachers:

> Practitioners simply know a great deal that they have never even tried to articulate. A major portion of the research agenda for the next decade will be to collect, collate, and interpret the practical knowledge of teachers for the purpose of establishing a case literature and codifying its principles precedents, and parables.

In their report on supervision in teacher education, McIntyre and Byrd (1998) remind us "that classroom teachers [in the professional development school partnership] can help to bring campus instruction and the problems of schools into greater agreement" (p. 420). Further, these researchers propose that "collaboration in planning, teaching, and supervision brings about greater articulation, and lead to improved schools and teacher preparation" (p. 420).

Heikkinen, McDevitt and Stone (1992) document efforts to develop shared school-university curriculum in a teacher education program. Experienced classroom teachers worked with faculty members to revise, deliver, and evaluate science and mathematics content and pedagogy courses. Such problems as effective use of time, materials, productive roles for the teaching fellows, and distribution of responsibilities for classroom teachers and university faculty were encountered and negotiated within the context of this partnership. Further, through exploring the implications for integrating teacher education curriculum, Knight, Wiseman and Smith (1992) and Williams (1996) detail similar dilemmas.

The first part of this paper portrays the context of the particular PDS community in which this process of curriculum deliberation unfolded. Included in this section is a descriptive comparison of the campus-based classroom management syllabus that was taught by a faculty member, and the PDS classroom learning environments (CLE) syllabus as taught by a team of mentor teachers and university faculty. The second part of the paper describes the process that developed as the university faculty and mentor teachers engaged in curriculum design, co-teaching, and assessment. The final section draws a set of assertions concerning the process and impact of such curriculum generation by a team of university faculty and elementary school teachers.

The research questions driving this study were: First, why do mentor teachers and university faculty in a school-university partnership choose to become involved in a process of developing a classroom learning environment syllabus? Second, how does this process emerge and modify? And, third, what impact does this evolving process have on children, preservice teachers, mentor teachers, and university faculty? The PDS classroom learning environments team members were two Professional Development Associates (university faculty), 11 elementary mentor teachers from the four PDS school sites, and a curriculum coordinator from the school district.

Context of this PDS Community

As is the case with most educational concepts that become popular over a rather short period of time, the label "professional development school" has come to mean many things to many people. Thus, it is important to attempt to describe the specific professional development school relationship in which the emergence of this particular collaborative curriculum planning and implementation is embedded.

The professional development school relationship between the State College Area School District and the Pennsylvania State University has developed slowly over an eight-year period. This partnership grew from the shared vision of an initiating group of faculty and administrators from this university and principals and teachers from this public school district. The members of this community believed that their collaborative efforts could result in better teacher preparation opportunities for preservice teachers and enhanced learning environments for the children in the public school system of this area. The school staffs and university faculty spent a year planning for the initial pilot year of actual PDS work that began in August 1998. A successful pilot year led to the expansion of the PDS concept to two additional elementary schools for the 1999-2000 school year. In this current year, 2000-2001, 32 interns were placed in four elementary schools for the yearlong internship. Inquiry on the part of interns, mentor teachers, and university faculty, who are called Professional Development Associates, is a core component of our professional development school collaborative. A second core principle that undergirds our PDS relationships is a commitment to collaborative decision-making and collaborative problem solving.

Current Structure

The primary vehicle around which the PDS program is structured is a year-long internship for senior undergraduate students. These students, who are selected jointly by the mentor teachers and university faculty, forego the university calendar and spend the entire school year in one of the elementary schools. Prospective interns apply for the opportunity to complete 30 credits of coursework in mathematics, science, social studies/literacy education and classroom learning environments, as well as 27 credits of student teaching. The internship begins with a two week "Jumpstart" on campus during mid-August that serves as an orientation to the internship, an opportunity for community building, and a beginning of the methods courses which interns take during the fall semester. During the fall semester each intern takes the four methods courses and also registers for 3 field experience credits. The interns officially begin their work with their mentor teacher on the first day of inservice activities for the school district though many of the interns worked with their mentors even earlier than that in order to prepare the classrooms for the first day of school. From September through January, the interns spend every day in school with their mentor teacher, leaving the classroom at 2:30 three days a week for methods classes which are held on site in the schools from 3:30 to 6:30 pm. These methods courses were designed and co-taught by teams of mentor teachers and university faculty through the auspices of a Lucent Technologies Foundation grant. During the second half of the year (January through June) interns focus on developing their classroom teaching style, planning and implementing curriculum, as well as understanding how to assess and support children's learning. Additionally, they engage in teacher inquiry projects focused on some aspect of their own teaching practice.

History of traditional campus taught course versus course in PDS context

C & S 405, Strategies in Classroom Management, has been taught for approximately twenty years as a campus-based course for preservice and inservice teachers. The course is an elective for undergraduates, but is over subscribed each semester. As taught on campus, the course differs significantly from the PDS version of the course (Appendix A) developed collaboratively by the curriculum planning team in four major areas, the situated context, the general focus of the course, and the assignments that students complete, and the instructor.

One of the significant differences between the courses in the two settings rests in the situated context of the elementary school PDS collaborative. The campus-based course is a generic classroom management course intended for early childhood, elementary, and secondary teachers. As a result, strategies are discussed at a fairly broad level, and the student is responsible for applying the generic strategies to his/ her particular teaching context. In the PDS course, all of the interns are teaching in elementary classrooms. Consequently, the course focuses entirely on the elementary setting.

A second substantial difference lies in the very title of the course. The campus-based course is entitled " Strategies in Classroom Management" (Appendix B). In keeping with the title, the course focuses primarily on strategies that the teacher might use to prevent classroom management problems from occurring, to cope with discipline problems when they do occur, and to solve long-range or chronic management problems. Although community building is advocated as a valuable strategy for preventing management problems, the multitude of contexts represented by the students makes it very difficult to deal with specific community building strategies. The PDS course is entitled, "Classroom Learning Environments." As the title indicates, the focus is not on management but on creating appropriate learning environments. One entire three-hour class period is devoted entirely to specific strategies for developing

classroom learning communities in which students feel safe, valued, cared for, and respected. Additionally, much more time is devoted to the interactions of student behavior with social, intellectual and emotional development.

A third difference is found in the assignments that students are asked to complete as part of the course. The PDS course assignments are embedded within the daily operation of the school and classroom and meld theory and practice in ways that are not possible apart from schools. In the campus-based course, students are required to read and critique various theories of management, to find and read journal articles concerning management, and to develop a philosophy of classroom management that is expressed in a letter sent home to parents. Course assignments in the PDS course include a case study of an individual learner who stands out intellectually, emotionally, or behaviorally. The case study is developed as a short report that could be shared with educational specialists. The mentor teacher is asked to provide guidance in selecting the student, in collecting appropriate observational and interview data, and in crafting the final report.

A second set of assignments in the PDS course requires interns to engage in as a series of management related tasks such as taking students to lunch or to special classes (for example, art and music), to conduct opening or closing routine, and to plan a game for recess. Interns carry out these activities and reflect on them. In addition, interns observe three classroom learning environments at varying grade levels and in two different specials. The final assignment requires the interns to construct a classroom management plan that includes: a profile of a hypothetical class, the physical layout of the room, a letter to parents expressing the intern's philosophy of management, a description of initial and ongoing community building activities, and a synopsis of important classroom routines that the intern will put in place in his/her own classroom.

The two courses also differ significantly in terms of the course instructors. The campus-based course is planned, delivered, and assessed by a single university faculty member. The PDS course was designed and delivered by the planning team described in this paper. The assessment of the course was planned by all of the members of the planning team, but it is only PDAs who actually assess the interns' work for grading purposes.

Although the PDS context provided the first instance of a required course in classroom learning environments for any preservice teacher program within the College, there has been a longstanding debate concerning the advisability of such an action. The Dean of the College of Education has received ten to twenty letters each academic year for the past ten to fifteen years from student teachers suggesting that a course in classroom management be required before the student teaching experience. These student teachers, who successfully completed their practicums, expressed the feeling that their experiences would have been facilitated if they had been better prepared for management issues. In addition, multiple surveys from cooperating teachers and alumni has recommended that a classroom management course be a required component of the preservice preparation program.

Faculty members, however, have been reluctant to adhere to this request for a variety of reasons. Some believe that classroom management is too technical an activity and should not be a component of preservice education. Others believe that classroom management is a rather straightforward activity, and they cannot imagine how an entire course might be devoted to such a pursuit. Others suggest that this type of knowledge cannot be gained on campus. It must be acquired in the world of the classroom as they see it. Finally, others would prefer to see any new course credits devoted to specific content areas

such as science, math, social studies, or language arts. As a result, requests from " the field" have fallen on deaf ears.

The nature of our PDS collaborative with its emphasis on collaboration and shared decision-making raises the voices of the mentor teachers to a new level. Faculty members working in the PDS context, who were genuinely sympathetic to the need for a learning environments course, wanted to demonstrate their attentiveness to mentor and intern needs. In response to the feedback received from the PDS interns and mentor teachers in the pilot year of the partnership and the calls from the research literature highlighting student teachers' perceptions of gaps in teacher preparation programs related to classroom management (Knowles, Cole & Presswood, 1994), the logistics of adding a course were considered. Since it was possible to build in one course without exceeding the full-time student credit load, the decision was made to include the classroom learning environments as a required part of the PDS curriculum.

Theoretical framework

This exploratory research employed a descriptive case study (Merriam, 1998) with a phenomenological lens. Moustakas (1994) described this approach as an "empirical approach involving a return to experience in order to obtain comprehensive descriptions that provide the basis for a reflective structural analysis that portrays the essences of the experience" (p. 13). The university faculty and mentor teachers' collaborative experience of planning and implementing the curriculum defined the bounded case study (Merriam, 1998).

Data collection and analysis

A focus group interview, written responses to email questions, individual reflections, field notes from planning meetings, and documents including syllabi were used to explore the process of team-based curriculum deliberation from the CLE planning team's point of view. The transcriptions and individual responses were analyzed using Nvivo computer software (Richards, 1999). Multiple readings identified categories (Patton, 1990) that emerged within each intern's narration. Line by line analysis of the transcripts resulted in the definition and construction of conceptual categories at "free nodes" and then to "nodes" in the tree-structure. Finally, we framed assertions from the analysis through support provided by Nvivo's concept modeling function. Additionally, data analysis probed for contradicting and sanctioning evidence for the themes (Erickson, 1986).

Findings

Findings from the initial research question that focused on why mentor teachers chose to become involved in the planning and implementation of the Classroom Learning Environments syllabus in the PDS context highlight four emergent themes. First, mentor teachers voiced dissatisfaction with the way the content of the campus-based methods courses did not mesh with the elementary school curriculum. Second, mentor teachers identified creating classroom learning environments as an area of personal expertise and wanted to share this with the PDS interns, other mentor teachers and university faculty. Third, mentor teachers expressed their beliefs that the university faculty respected their beliefs and classroom practices. Consequently, these mentor teachers felt comfortable about opening their ideas about curricula and classroom practice to the critique of other members of the CLE planning team. Mentor teachers saw participating in the process of designing curriculum as an opportunity to further explore (with the university faculty's guidance) what it means to be a teacher educator. Fourth, exploring ways in which theory and practice could be further infused in this PDS context stimulated mentor teachers' interest in participating in the planning team.

Campus-based course content versus PDS context course content

Making a better match of the content of the campus-based curriculum and the school district's curriculum was a significant reason why mentor teachers were willing to participate in the planning responsibilities for the field-based CLE syllabus. The research literature highlights studies in which aspects of the curriculum content offered by traditional elementary method courses tended to be mismatched with the content needs of the preservice teacher and the children in the classroom, or the timing of the delivery of content was inappropriate (Applegate, 1986; Cole & Knowles, 1993; Knowles, Cole & Presswood, 1994). Bev (a kindergarten mentor teacher) volunteered as a member of the CLE team as she "wanted to make sure that the requirements of the methods class were appropriate for the interns and my kindergarten children." Judi (a first grade mentor teacher) wanted to be part of writing the CLE course so that "we could ensure that the assignments meshed with what the interns would be experiencing in the classroom." Additionally, Judi "thought that this would be a good opportunity for me to help make the course more applicable to the classroom." Likewise, Linda (a second grade mentor teacher) was inspired to participate in the collaborative planning for similar reasons. She recalled another example of this curriculum disparity:

> Whatever I was teaching wasn't the right time to fit in with the tasks the preservice teacher had to do. When I was teaching magnets, the preservice teachers were required to do a bulletin board for their class on campus. Nothing seemed to be authentic.

Marcia (a first grade mentor teacher) ascribed the difference between the campus-based and the integrated field experience courses to the source of the curriculum. She believes the curriculum "from the classroom, the children and the school in the 'real world' should tie to the philosophies, models and visions of those who teach in the university world. It is not two separate issues." When these were infused, Marcia espoused that curricula could be "woven into one meaningful message."

Designing a field-based syllabus that was flexible with regards to implementing assignments and selecting grade-appropriate issues was a motive for participating as a member of the CLE planning team. Mentor teachers recognize that PDS interns learn to teach in an individualized way. Mentor teachers needed a syllabus that allowed them to use their judgment as to when an intern was ready to try different classroom management strategies. In contributing to the construction of the CLE curriculum, mentor teachers gave themselves permission to make changes to the syllabus. Shared ownership of the process "freed them of guilt" if they altered the order of tasks. One mentor teacher "felt confident about making the changes since I was responsible for helping design the syllabus." Additionally, developing a syllabus that could be modified across the grades was a catalyst for Bonnie (second grade mentor teacher) who believes such flexibility "gives the interns a deeper understanding of the actual teaching process and how to make it meaningful to the students."

Personal expertise and experiences

Mentor teachers identified their own expertise and interest as driving forces behind their voluntary participation in the CLE curriculum team. Marcia confidently stated that she "had some definite strengths to offer in this area and was willing to work in collaboration with fellow professionals and interns." Likewise, Judi chose the CLE team "because of the interest in reading books and articles from the Responsive Classroom newsletter, and working to make some changes in my own classroom." She wanted to "help create a syllabus that would allow preservice teachers to gain confidence and a repertoire of ideas for building a positive classroom environment." Furthermore, Cathy (a first grade mentor teacher) pointed to the years of experience accumulated between the members of the CLE team as a

teacher) pointed to the years of experience accumulated between the members of the CLE team as a significant source of expertise to guide these preservice teachers.

> When I first started to teach, this whole idea of the learning environment didn't enter my mind really as being so important. I think new teachers tend to look at it that way unless they're specifically presented with information that we've amassed over the years. It's important for us to put all of our experiences together. How many years? Lots!

Mutual respect and trust

'Trusting relationships,' and 'mutual respect' were phrases consistently offered by the members of the CLE team as essential motives for their participation in planning and co-teaching this methods course. Marcia described "the group of professionals among many who I highly respected and enjoyed having lively discussions about differing educational philosophies." Bev described her involvement with the PDS faculty in its pilot year as a time for building trusting relationships with the PSU faculty who "I knew would listen to us [teachers] regarding what was important." She expressed confidence that "the classroom teachers' concerns, suggestions and contributions would be factored into the development of the curriculum." Lynne, a PDA, further elaborated:

> When 11 high powered master teachers brainstorm what works with children and what interns need to learn about classroom management, wonderful ideas get generated. When these teachers respect and listen to one another, as they did, the end result is dynamic. Everyone contributed, and felt ownership. When you seek out the expertise of many people, the end result is always better than if one person does it alone.

Another mentor teacher was inspired to participate since she wanted to be sure that the university faculty were reminded of what daily classroom teaching entailed. She had developed:

> this feeling that university people were not in the real world. In the trenches, it is different for teachers. It was wonderful to realize that there are university people who listen.

Established relationships with university faculty prompted mentor teachers to volunteer as a participant in order to meet personal goals. Tonya (a third grade mentor teacher), who is a PSU graduate from the College of Education, decided to participate because she "enjoyed mentoring students but had never experienced the opportunity to shape curriculum in the area of teacher education. This is one of my personal goals. I hope to possibly become a teacher educator at the university level in the future." As a final excerpt, Judi

> knew that I would enjoy working with Jim because of the work I had done with him before. The teachers' input would be heard and appreciated by him. I also looked at what teachers had chosen to work in this area and knew that I could work with all of them.

Theory and practice

Exploring ways in which theory and practice could be further infused in this PDS context stimulated mentor teachers' interest in participating in the planning team. Past efforts to merge theory and practice in field-based clinical experiences show university teacher educators and their school-based partners making collaborative attempts to reconceptualize and deliver teacher education methods courses (Heaton & Lampert, 1993; Heikkinen, & McDevitt, 1992). An incentive for the mentor teachers and the

university faculty in this school-university partnership to collaborate in the production of a redesigned CLE course was the shared view that "a traditional syllabus is the work of the professor - the expert model. Our syllabus (Appendix A) is a "wedding" of theory and practice and included what is practical and what really works when dealing with students." Tonya advocated the benefits for preservice teachers experiencing a course that is developed by "university and our school faculty":

> Faculty members possess insights that are meaningful to teaching interns. Classroom teachers have their experiences in the trenches. At times, teacher education lacks the insight and involvement of active teachers. By being involved in developing the CLE syllabus, teacher involvement could bring an added level of practicality to the learning experience.

Other mentor teachers premised that "when a theory from a reading is discussed in class, the implications of that theory can be directly related to happenings in the classrooms that interns are experiencing. This makes the theory come alive for them. It is easier to connect theory with practice when they are both being learned simultaneously." Additionally, the presence of classroom teachers as course instructors also expands the practical examples that can be used to help the interns develop a deeper understanding of both theory and practice.

> The main difference is that the students have direct access to a classroom everyday so that the assignments can be carried out using real children in real situations. The assignments are more practical because the students are working with their own classes. Using classroom teachers to help teach the course combines theory and practice in a very clear way for the preservice teachers. Classroom teachers demonstrate that there is not one right way to do things- something young practitioners need to learn.

Design, co-teaching and assessment

The second research question explored the process of design, implementation and assessment of the CLE syllabus. Mentor teachers described this process as team-driven and collaborative, and identified the roles and relationships that emerged as the process evolved.

The PDS classroom learning environments team consisted of 14 members: two Professional Development Associates (university faculty), 11 elementary mentor teachers from the four PDS school sites, and a curriculum coordinator from the school district. Mentor teachers were very proud of the fact they "had all volunteered." Marcia highlighted the "tremendous ideas," and "energy" that were generated, which she believed "made the process and outcomes so positive." Further,

> The group had strengths, give and take, and sound thinking about what was needed from the classroom point of view. The process of developing the syllabus came through discussion – a collaborative process that was guided by Jim, with that Belinda 'twist,' and had the principles from the university. The process began to 'weave.' Lynne knew the process from an administrative point of view. We all had input and our sharing, editing, and collaborating stimulated the vast knowledge we hold.

Design

The CLE curriculum team met for three days during the 1999 summer to determine the course goal, and the specifics objectives for the classroom learning environments syllabus. As Bev recalled:

> We wanted the student teacher interns to evaluate the physical learning environment, learn 'kid watching' strategies and make sense of their observations (both in their assigned classrooms and at other age levels), begin to develop good classroom management strategies, witness parent conferences, and build a personal management statement. This would highlight each intern's beliefs as a teacher, and include an 'ideal' plan of the physical environment. Further, interns were asked to explain how one could build a sense of community in the classroom, as well as describe the general routines that promote a positive classroom environment.
>
> After these topics were determined, the CLE group planned the activities the interns would accomplish to meet the objectives. For this activity planning we broke up into smaller groups of three or four to help develop specific topics. Each small group determined what professional reading enhanced the topic, what types of experiences would be meaningful to the interns, and how the work would be evaluated. At the end of the week, all participants shared their piece of the syllabus and assignments were coordinated with each topic. This syllabus was used with the interns for the fall semester of 1999.

With reference to the construction of the assignments, Judi described how "the team broke up into four groups. Groups worked on the weekly jobs, the case study, the observation assignment and the management plan. After the assignments were developed we shared, fine tuned, and set the time line."

Designing the syllabus allowed the team members room to be creative with the university-driven schedule of a campus-taught class. Traditionally, a three-credit class meets for three hours weekly. We looked at the needs of our preservice teachers and the children and decided to try a variation of this schedule. Instead of offering the course for three hours of contact time every week during the semester, the planning team decided on an alternative model. We hypothesized that many of the key concepts that were the major focus of the course could be learned through a process of action and reflection in the classroom. We decided that learning did not occur only in the presence of the course instructor. Consequently, we set about the task of planning classroom and school-based experiences that would help the interns to learn by connecting the course readings to what was happening in their classroom contexts. This allowed us to reduce the contact hours considerably without reducing learning.

A second decision regarding the scheduling of contact hours resulted in a front-loading of contact hours with the instructional team. All of the twenty-eight contact hours occured during the Jumpstart program prior to the beginning of the school year and during the first month of school. We made this decision in order to match the rhythms of the school year and the lives of the mentors more closely. The planning team believed that issues of classroom learning environments (establishing the physical environment, building community, building relationships, and establishing routines and expectations.) dominated the thinking of the mentor teachers during the early part of the year and faded into the background over time. We believed that it would be extremely beneficial to have the interns heavily engaged in classroom learning environments at the same time that their mentors were pre-occupied with those issues. This arrangement worked extremely well, except in one aspect. Both the interns and the planning team mourned the loss of contact over time. During the second year of implementation, the team continued to front-load the contact hours but maintained monthly contact with the interns over the course of the entire semester. One of the mentor teachers commented on the from-loading decision,

> I think that the focusing on the classes at the beginning of the semester when interns and mentor teachers are beginning to build their classroom learning environments was important. Then we moved to holding class every three weeks and focused the syllabus on what the interns and mentor

teachers are actually doing in the classroom.

The syllabus was written in such a way that flexibility was a prominent feature. A PDA described how:

> we structured it, week one, try this, week two, try this, week three. But we built into that flexibility to meet the needs of the children in our classrooms and the needs of our interns. It was possible to flip-flop and change those activities around. We didn't have to follow week one, check off, week two, check off. That there was flexibility between the intern and the mentor teacher to decide how that process would play out. I remember we built in weeks where they could go back and try something else that they were struggling with. They could go back and try something else that was different. Further, we built into the reflection on those weeks as part of their journal writing to make connections to the rest of their PDS experience.

Co-teach

Additionally, co-teaching was planned between the university faculty and the mentor teachers. This strategy reinforced the credibility of the course in the eyes of the interns because mentors, whom, they respected, were delivering the instruction. Additionally, the mentors were able to provide great variety and depth in terms of adding practical examples and considerations to the ideas encountered in readings and discussions. As one mentor teacher commented,

> It is really meaningful to have the teachers involved in the instruction of the classes. The interns feel that the mentor teachers know what they are talking about, as well as the professors

Assessment

During the following summer 2000, the CLE team reunited to assess the course syllabus and make changes. Having lived through the first year of the collaboratively planned syllabus, mentor teachers described specific changes that were made.

> We made changes in terms of when things would happen. We altered the timing of assignments. The case study task was too early in the syllabus. We needed more time for the mentor teacher and intern to get to know the children.

Intern feedback was sought out by the members of the CLE curriculum team. In doing so mentor teachers and university faculty modeled effective assessment practices for their interns. One mentor teacher reflected how "it was really helpful to have reaffirmed what we were thinking. We made changes in the case study because of some comments that the interns offered. I felt more comfortable asking them about something that I had helped design."

Assertions

Five assertions focus the impact of this collaborative curriculum experience for mentor teachers, preservice teachers, children, and university faculty.

Assertion 1: Collaborative planning and implementation requires trusting relationships, mutual respect, the valuing of expertise offered by each team member, and shared ownership of the planning process.

The unfolding role of the university faculty member who previously taught the campus-based

course was a significant aspect of this collaborative planning and implementation. The trusting relationship between this member and the rest of the team gave a supporting foundation to the emergence of the collaborative curriculum process. Mentor teachers offered such comments as:

> Jim had a great way of giving us an overview of what we said in a way that sounded like we knew what we were talking about.
>
> He made suggestions. He didn't say page this and this. Rather, he suggested, 'This might be a good place to look.' In this way, it wasn't cumbersome for us to try to find appropriate articles.
>
> I think that the strongest link though, one of the most important component, is having a faculty member like Jim who led because he makes us feel like we are a valuable part of the process, and the most important part. I didn't feel for a minute that anything I said was inappropriate.
>
> He had an open agenda. He didn't come in wanting us to come up with his preconceived plan.
>
> He knew how to pull our thoughts together and refocus us.
>
> He showed us respect. He turned it over to us and trusted us to do a good job as we took on these teaching responsibilities.
>
> At the end of the first planning session, I remember saying to him, 'Is this what you had expected the syllabus to look like?', and he said, "No." I said, 'Do you feel comfortable with what we came up with?' And he said, 'Very comfortable.' He came in with some ideas, but he was willing to change what he was thinking when we made suggestions.
>
> I think the process of developing the syllabus was also the process of developing those trusting relationships, and the mutual respect of the teachers respecting one another's thoughts and ideas. Also respecting the theory that came from those at the University, and listening to Jim and Belinda and to the teachers. The product was supposed to be was a syllabus, but within the process there was a great amount of trust building. And the sharing increased because all of us felt as if our ideas were valued.

Mindy, one of the school district's curriculum coordinator noted "our belief systems were all in line." One mentor teacher expressed her philosophy:

> Building the community is, for me, the most important part of the classroom. When we have that community in a true sense, with respect and all the other components that we build into it, then we reduce the need for classroom management strategies. It's a very important part of everything we do.

<u>Assertion 2</u>: Mentor teachers benefit from participating in collaborative curriculum planning in many ways, as teachers, as mentors, as colleagues, and as teacher educators.

<u>Impact on mentor teacher's practice</u>

> Specifically, mentor teachers identified their interest in their own professional development

and the impact of this experience on their classroom practice. Bev suggested that she is "particularly interested in developing my own skills in this area. Because of my involvement on this committee, I am better prepared to offer a nurturing classroom for my students. As well as focusing on quality professional reading, I attended a Responsive Classroom conference that was recommended by my colleagues on the CLE curriculum team." Judi advocated the connection between changes in her own practice and her experience of co-teaching parts of the syllabus to the preservice teachers.

> Whenever I have to teach something, I get better at it. Thinking about the syllabus requirements and putting the course together made me look at what I'm doing in the classroom. As I think about my practices and reflect on them, I refine strategies and try new ideas.

And, Debbie (a second grade mentor teacher) was encouraged to broaden her professional reading.

> I am reading books like crazy. They are from the Responsive Classroom newsletter and anything else I can find.

Improve mentoring skills with PDS interns

Mentor teachers and interns conversed about the syllabus and its requirements. The mentor teachers were also involved in carrying out the assignments that were included in the course requirements. Conversations concerning the various assignments and activities provided mentors and interns additional opportunities to interact about substantive issues. As a result, mentors were able to influence and extend the thinking of their interns in ways that might not have been possible without the course.

Interns commented that they felt their mentor teachers were more in tune with what interns had to do because they were part of the planning syllabus. CLE team members assisted other mentor teachers and interns in the building through conversations with colleagues who may not have been part of our immediate group. Interns felt more comfortable having conversations with mentor teachers about the syllabus because of their roles in the planning process.

Principles of learning and teaching

Unlike traditional student teaching where a unidirectional act of handing over the reigns of classroom activities occurs at various points, mentor teachers engaged the PDS interns in a constant 'exchange of the reigns.' One of the tasks assigned to the interns in the CLE syllabus was to be responsible for conducting a morning greeting. When Corinne felt she was ready to try this, she and Judi worked out a schedule that permitted Corinne to direct opening time three mornings a week and observe Judi (or another teacher in the building) during the other two. This pattern continued throughout the internship. Corinne and Judi recognized the benefits of interchanging observing and teaching, as Judi noted:

> We can model it for them [interns] again. If they keep doing it, we can give them feedback, but they can only analyze their teaching from one perspective. The first time the interns do it, it's getting the pieces together and thinking about the order of the steps. After the first morning meeting, every intern I have taught with has said, 'That's so much

> harder than it looks.' As they get comfortable with the flow of things, then they can watch us and they pick something else up.

Another comment that the interns made about the classroom learning environment's curriculum in particular was they felt that they didn't have to take on a responsibility and then it was always theirs.

Tacit knowledge

One of the challenges that the interns faced while learning with an experienced teacher is helping their experienced partner make explicit his or her beliefs about children and teaching. As she demonstrates a teaching lesson, and observes and co-reflects on the delivery of her intern's lesson, a mentor teacher models ways of thinking about teaching and learning. Through this process, a mentor teacher helps an intern develop "strategic knowledge" (Shulman, 1987), which is knowledge that comes into play as the teacher seeks to manage the exchange of ideas in the context of coordinating social interactions (Heaton & Lampert, 1993). Experienced teachers hold flexible knowledge, not in a rigid or scripted form, but rather in a web of connected ideas that can be selected and implemented as determined by the nature of the social interaction with a child or group of children (Feinman-Nemser & Remillard, 1996). As the members of the CLE team planned and co-taught the syllabus, mentor teachers reminded each other:

> When we're teaching it day to day, we tend to internalize why. We do it because we've done it that way for so long. We have to remember to articulate to our interns. Sometimes we don't even know we're doing it. When the interns question us, we can explain it.

Extending collegial relationships within and across the PDS sites by sharing resources and expertise

Opportunities to extend their mentoring relationships through on-going conversations with their colleagues emerged from their curriculum planning and co-teaching experiences. Judi described how "teachers in our building who weren't on this committee asked us questions to further explain parts of the syllabus." Bev highlighted the opportunity to work with district teachers as "always a pleasure. It has been a very positive experience to develop the CLE curriculum with teachers from different grade levels and buildings who I rarely have a chance to see." And, another team member relished the experience of working across buildings since "we don't very often get a chance to come together from different buildings and share ideas and work together. We were able to make bonds with people outside our grade planning teams and to work with University people." Marcia advocated that a sense of community across the four PDS building sites during the team-planning meeting led her "to feel more comfortable with the planning roles."

Assertion 3: Curriculum that is collaboratively planned and taught by university faculty and school-based partners assists interns to become more effective classroom managers, lesson planners, 'kid watchers, collaborators, and risk-takers.

Classroom teachers and university faculty agreed that some tasks are not included in a traditional student teaching experience that support and encourage preservice teachers' focus on developing strategies to create a positive learning environment in their classroom. As Bev premised, "becoming an

effective classroom manager is one of the areas that beginning teachers are most nervous, and it is important for teacher-educators to address these needs." At the conclusion of the course, several of the mentor teachers identified a marked improvement in the variety and level of development of classroom management strategies, as well as the management competency of their student teachers. Judi summarized many of the mentor teachers' observations:

> PDS interns don't seem to struggle with management as much as I expected a traditional student teacher to. They really have a good sense of how to respond, and how to be proactive when it comes to situations in the classroom. That's a direct result of having a course that helps them.

Belinda (PDA) noted "the way we collaboratively structured the syllabus helped the interns to understand that classroom management is not something we haven't got one day, and we master the next. After we build that classroom community, it has to be sustained. How do we negotiate this when the environment starts to fall apart?"

In advocating a relationship between improved classroom management strategies and lesson planning, mentor teachers proposed that PDS interns focus on ways to support children's learning. One mentor teacher declared how " interns do not simply create these great activities to fill the day. Their lessons aren't busy work. They ask open-ended questions and practice inquiry." Further, Judi expressed that, "managing the children is part of the interns' thought processes as they're doing their lesson plans. The interns think about how are the children going to get their supplies, and how they going to be put into groups. The interns realize that management is part of the planning process, not only the activities."

Through living the CLE curriculum, Tonya asserted that interns develop their observational skills and become better 'kid watchers.' Consequently, these preservice teachers become more sensitive to the needs of the children in their classrooms "because we model for them that management is as important as anything they are teaching. We show them that management messages are woven into their teaching. It's all an intricate part of the day. We're focusing on how to create a learning environment in which all children are valued and all are helped to be successful in some way, rather than discipline, punishment, and consequences."

While student teaching is not always considered as a time for taking risks, Debbie pointed out when "interns build the community with us from the beginning of the year and become a part of the community, they are willing to take risks in the classroom. While I was busy organizing some materials, Andrea [PDS intern] self-organized a class meeting to resolve a class problem. She modeling for the children how to take a risk and be a member of our classroom community."

When they recognize the expert knowledge of their mentor teachers, PDS interns feel more comfortable with constructive feedback from their classroom mentor teachers. Rather than feeling judged, the PDS interns were comforted by their mentor teacher's experience in the area of classroom learning environments. Additionally, as the support mentor teachers offered reduced the defensive attitude that sometimes appears in aspects of traditional student teaching experiences (Knowles, Cole & Presswood, 1994), collaboration was fostered. As she illustrated this notion, Sheila commented:

> I see their willingness to take constructive feedback and learn from it. I see a lot less defensiveness from the interns. I don't sense them thinking, 'I'm right the first time. I don't need your ideas.' This builds our relationship.

In giving up their after-school time to co-teach the syllabus, mentor teachers demonstrated to the PDS interns that "we think they [PDS interns] are important, and what they're learning is important." We are willing to come and do this for them because this is a unifying aspect of our teaching practice. Also, we believe our teaching strength comes from being a team." The power of our collaboration lies in showing the PDS interns that mentor teachers and university faculty were "working together, so that there isn't 'the us' and 'the them.' We do not want to be giving the interns mixed messages." As Cathy summarized,

> The PDS interns are seeing the value of collaboration and professionals working together and sharing ideas. None of us necessarily have ultimate answers, but together we can solve problems and develop good instruction for children.

<u>Assertion 4</u>: Children who are students in PDS classrooms benefit from being taught by interns who are better at creating positive classroom learning environments.

Despite a number of research articles focusing on professional development schools, only a few of these studies explore the influence of PDS work on children's schooling experiences (Book, 1996). While highlighting the paucity of such studies, the call has been issued for research that examines the impact of PDS efforts on K – 12 student outcomes (Abdal-Haqq, 1998; Book, 1996; Silva, 1999; Valli, Cooper, & Frankes, 1997). The inherent difficulties associated with applying standardized measures to evaluate authentic student activities that have relevance and meaning for children are acknowledged in efforts to provide evidence for reforming schools (Newmann, 1991). Additionally, these are connected to the challenges of isolating distinct variables in PDS work that directly relate to student achievement (Knight, Wiseman, & Cooner, 2000). As Debbie explained, "many student teachers don't know about management and the children suffer when the student teachers take over. After the student teacher finishes, we [the classroom teachers] are left to 'whip' the children back into shape. I don't feel I need to do that now." And, Sheila added:

> Teachers who may not have been willing to try something new are trying because they have an intern who has new knowledge. Also, the mentors have the support of the university faculty. One of my mentors in third grade has not done stations before. They [the mentor and intern] are so excited about doing these stations. Mindy [a district language and literacy curriculum coordinator] has been helping.
>
> A class meetings is another example that many mentor teachers may or may not have tried before. Now, with the support of their intern, these classroom teachers are doing these, and the children benefit.

<u>Assertion 5</u>: In collaboratively planning and co- teaching the CLE curriculum, the role of the university faculty member is reshaped.

Teaching a campus-based course allows the faculty member the luxury of being unchanged by the experience. This is especially true when the faculty member is viewed by students as having

a particular expertise in the domain under study. While many faculty members choose not to take such a path, it is possible to teach an entire course without having one's practice really challenged. While this lack of vulnerability may be comforting, it is also a double-edged sword. Once the student leaves the professor's side, it is very easy to dismiss the faculty member's ideas as too theoretical or idealistic.

Shannon (1994) proposes that the experience afforded to students enrolled in the traditionally campus-taught block of coursework is not always extended into student teaching experiences. Further, Shapiro and Sheehan (cited in Shannon, 1994, p. 37) elaborate:

> when students leave the controlled university setting and enter the school systems, the coordination of the experiences becomes much more difficult. The goals of the student teaching experience must be in common to the student teacher, the cooperating teacher, and the university supervisor for the experience to be successful.

Additionally, conclusions drawn by Von Eschenbach and Noland (1981) highlight the impact of university professors on student teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning during the teaching of the methodology courses. However, as they moved into the final student teaching block, student teachers were often more influenced by the different values and philosophies of their cooperating teachers. These researchers claim that student teachers can be "caught between cooperating teachers who are more practical and university supervisors who are more theoretically focused" (Shannon, 1994, p. 37). A collaboratively planned and taught curriculum can go far to dispel the often taken-for-granted assumption that classroom teachers 'live in the trenches' and university faculty in the 'ivory tower.'

When the university faculty member teaches in and lives in the PDS classroom context, his/her ideas are open to challenge and scrutiny on an ongoing basis. Interns and mentors naturally are inclined in such a setting to invite the faculty member to help them deal with issues and problems in their daily interactions with children. Refusing to help in these circumstances undermines the PDS relationship, therefore, the faculty member's expertise is open to scrutiny on a regular basis. For us, the benefits of scrutiny and vulnerability have far outweighed the disadvantages. There have been many occasions on which faculty members have been able to model very effective practices in coping with real problems successfully. On the other hand, there have been just as many situations where we were unsuccessful in dealing with the difficult situation. We have learned that the result does not seem to be as important as the effort. A willingness to make oneself vulnerable and to expose the potential inadequacies of one's understandings testifies to the complexity of the world of teaching and also models lifelong learning for both interns and mentors.

Mentor teachers propose that the dual role of a PDA as a member of the CLE planning team and a university supervisor affords an opportunity for the supervisory role to be reshaped in the PDS context. According to Judi, this duality offers one way for the role of the supervisor to shift from one of observer to that of participator as a member of the classroom community.

> This is one of the strengths of our CLE curriculum. The PDA has always come in and supported the interns as a member of our community. The PDA will join us in meetings or works a center. The children view her or him as a member of the community, and if they don't always show up the children ask the PDA, where were you?

Further as they begin to share some of the teaching responsibilities in the classroom, PDAs adopt a modelling role of best practices rather than a threatening evaluative role for the interns (Gimbert & Nolan, 2001).

Conclusion

Prior to exploring the depth and impact of our collaborative curriculum deliberations, a comparison of the campus-based classroom management course and the classroom learning environments course in the PDS revealed significant differences in four aspects: the context, the general focus of the course, the assignments that students complete, and the instructor. While preservice teachers benefit from exploring the generic strategies offered in the campus-based course, PDS interns are afforded a focused context that nurtures specific community building strategies in a myriad of grade levels. In addition to the differing content and foci of the assignments, PDS interns are exposed to a multitude of perspectives and philosophies.

Collaborative planning and teaching requires trusting relationships, mutual respect, valuing of expertise offered by each team member, and shared ownership of the process. When incubated in the context of a PDS, a process of team-based curriculum deliberation nurtures a process for reversing three negative aspects of socialization to teaching that have in the past defined institutional approaches to teacher learning and preparation: "Figure it out yourself"; "do it all yourself"; and "keep it to yourself" (Darling-Hammond, 1994, p. 8). Emerging from this particular collaborative process of curriculum design and implementation within our school-university partnership are important notions that shape the process of learning to teach for preservice teachers: developing effective classroom managers, bettering 'kid watching' skills, building collegial relationships, and taking risks. Further, the teaching beliefs and practices of members of the CLE planning team, who serve the dual roles of teacher educator and classroom teacher, and the university faculty are exposed to our PDS community for sharing and modelling. And, most importantly, the impact of such curriculum deliberation and implementation on the social and academic achievement of the children becomes central to the shaping of the syllabus.

At what point are we now with our curriculum deliberation? Our better problem is finding efficient ways to sustain our collaborative efforts in order to continue this planning and co-teaching. Given the time constraints imposed by our commitments to other aspects of PDS work, how can we continue to function as an effective curriculum team? Additionally, questions such as the following warrant future research. How can school and university structures be massaged to support collaborative efforts to plan and implement preservice teacher curriculum? What is the impact of such curriculum on the development of the preservice teachers? How do such collaborative curriculum efforts contribute to changing schools and university cultures? And, what is the impact of collaborative curriculum deliberations on student achievement in a PDS community?

References

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Applegate, J. (1986). Undergraduate students' perception of field experiences: Toward a framework for study. In J. D. Rath & L. G. Katz (Eds.), Advances in teacher education, Volume 2 (pp. 21 – 38). Norwood NJ: Alex.

Book, C. L. (1996). Professional development schools. In J. Sikula (Ed.), Handbook on teacher education (2nd edition, pp. 194 – 210). New York: Macmillan.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1994). The power of teacher research in teacher education. In S. Hollingsworth and H. Sockett (Eds.), Teacher research and educational reform. Ninety-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (pp. 142 – 165). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Cole, A., & Knowles, J. (1993). Shattered images: Understanding expectations and realities of field experiences. Teaching and Teacher Education, 9, 457 - 471.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory to practice in the education of teachers. Bloomington, IL: Pubic School Publisher.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. Whittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. 3rd ed. (pp. 119 – 161). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Fieman-Nemser, S., & Remillard, J. (1996). Perspectives of learning to teach. In Frank B. Murray (Ed.), The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers. (pp. 63 – 91) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gimbert, B. G., & Nolan, J. F. (2001) *The influence of the professional development school context on supervisory practice: University faculty and intern's perspectives*. Manuscript under review.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990) Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guyton, E., & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research in teacher education, (pp. 514 - 534). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Heaton, R., & Lampert, M. (1993). Learning to hear voices: Inventing a new pedagogy of teacher education. In D. K. Cohen, M. W. McLaughlin, and J. E. Talbert (Eds.), Teaching for understanding: Challenges for policy and practice. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Heikkinen, H. W., & McDevitt, T. M. (1992). Classroom teachers as agents of reform in university teacher preparation programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(4), 283 – 289.

The Holmes Group (1986) Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI.

The Holmes Group (1990) Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI.

Knight, S. L., Wiseman, D. L. & Cooner, D. (2000). Using collaborative teacher research to determine the impact of professional development school activities on elementary students' math and writing outcomes. Journal of Teacher Education, 51(1), 26 – 38.

Knight, S.L., Wiseman, D., & Smith, C. W. (1992). The reflectivity-activity dilemma in school-university partnerships. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(3), 269 – 277.

Knowles, J. Gary., Coles, A. L., and Presswood, C. S. (1994). Through preservice teachers' eyes: Exploring field experiences through narrative and inquiry. New York: Macmillan College Publishing Company.

Knowles, J. Gary., & Skrobola, N. (1992, April). We watched them "fail": University supervisors' perceptions of preservice teachers who "failed" student teaching. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Levine, M. (1992) A conceptual framework for professional practice schools. In M. Levine (Ed.), Professional practice schools: Linking teacher education and school reform. New York: Teachers College Press.

McIntrye, D. John., & Byrd, D. M. (1998). Supervision in teacher education. In G. R. Firth and E. F. Pajak (Eds.), Handbook of research on school supervision (pp. 409 – 427). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. San

Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Newmann, F. M. (1991). Linking restructuring to authentic student achievement. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 458 – 463.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Richards, T., & Richards, L. (1999). Nvivo Qualitative Data Analysis software. San Francisco, CA: Sage Publications.

Sandoval, P. (1996). How deep is collaboration? Teacher education curriculum, course curriculum, and the field. Contemporary Education 67(4), 233 – 236.

Shannon, D. S. (1994). The development of preservice teacher knowledge. The professional educator, 17(1), 31 – 39.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1 – 22.

Valli, L., Cooper, D., Frankes, L. (1997). Professional development schools and equity: A critical analysis of rhetoric and research. Review of Research in Education, 22, (pp. 251 - 304). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Von Eshenbach, J. F., & Noland, L. A. (1981). Changes in teachers' perceptions of the creative pupil. Creative Child and Adult Quarterly, 6(3), 169 – 177.

Williams, R. O. (1996). Professional Development Schools: Facing the challenge of institutionalization. Contemporary Education, 67(4), 171 – 179

Appendix A

C & S 405 Syllabus - Fall 2000
Creating and Sustaining Classroom Learning Environments
Section 02
PDS Interns at Ferguson, Matternville, Park Forest and Radio Park

Course Instructors

Professional Development Associates (PDAs)

Belinda Gimbert	Jim Nolan	Lynne Sanders	Sheila Abruzzo
238 Chambers	148 Chambers	College Heights Center	238 Chambers
865-6569	865-2243	231-1084	865-6569
bgg111@psu.edu	jimnolan@psu.edu	mls11@scasd.k12.pa.us	she64@home.com

Mentor teachers

Bonnie Abrams, Tonya Black, Beverley Bruening, Mindy Cocolin, Marcia Heitzmann, Cathy Humphrey, Judi Kur, Debbie Patrick, Tina Schultz, Linda Witmer.

Texts

Levin, J & Nolan, J. F. (2000). Principles of classroom management: A professional decision-making model. (3rd. Ed.) Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
Charles, C. M. (1999). Building classroom discipline. (6th Ed.) Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Longman.
Denton, P. & Kriete, R. (2000). The first six weeks of school Greenfield, MA: Northeast Foundation for Children.

Course Overview

This course has been designed for interns in the Professional Development Schools program, an initiative between Penn State University and the State College Area School District. Interns will examine in-depth the processes of creating and sustaining a classroom learning community that fosters and enables success for all children.

Goals

Specifically, PDS interns will:

1. become aware of a variety of belief systems concerning effective classroom management.

2. begin to examine and reflect upon their classroom management belief system.

3. begin to understand the processes of creating a dynamic classroom learning environment where students are motivated, supported, engaged and responsible learners.

4. develop and enhance observational skills of individual children, groups of children, and

classroom learning environments.

5. begin to develop an understanding of how to use the physical environment and interpersonal relationships to create a sense of community in the classroom.

6. identify and use a variety of management tools effectively.

7. begin to develop effective communication practices with all members of the school community.

8. become aware of developmentally appropriate practices and behavior at a variety of grade levels.

9. begin to learn ways to adapt the classroom environment so that all children will be successful.

Class Schedule

Class One (in Jump Start - Wednesday August 16th): 3 hours

Readings for this session: None

Topic: Course Overview
Beliefs about Classroom management
What does classroom management mean?

Class Two (in Jump Start - Tuesday August 22nd): 3 hours

Readings for this session: Assigned chapter from Charles; and Levin & Nolan, Chapter 4.

Topic: Models of classroom management
Distinguishing Observations from Judgments

Class Three (in Jump Start – Thursday, August 24th); 3 hours; 8:50 at MATTERNVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Readings for Day: Chapter 6 in Levin & Nolan; First Six Weeks- Introductory material – Prime factors, Using this book, and Key Terms 1-26

Topic: Classroom Organization: The Physical Environment

9.00 – 9.30 a.m. discuss individual wonderings/questions and generate group wonderings about setting up/organizing a classroom.
Visit to Bonnie Abrams' second grade classroom and Bev Bruening's kindergarten classroom at Matternville Elementary School, 9.30 - 10.45 am; Visit Joe Shirk's fifth grade classroom at Park Forest Elementary School, 11.00 am - 12 noon for

observations/questions/discussion.

Class Four Monday, September 11th: 3:30 - 6.30 p.m.

Reading for this session: Chapters 1 and 2 in First Six Weeks

Topic: Building community and relationships in the classroom. Panel of Teachers- Debbie Patrick, Tina Schultz, Tonya Black, and Cathy Humphrey.

Bring Observation notes and journals for Observation Assignment Topic 1 to class. Assignment is due today

Class Five Tuesday, October 10th: 3.30 - 6.30 p.m.

Readings for this session: First Six Weeks Chapters 3 & 4 and Establishing Rules, Chapter 6 in Levin & Nolan.

Topic: Establishing, maintaining, and restoring productive learning environments. Panel of teachers: Bonnie Abrams, Judi Kur, Brian Peters, Linda Witmer, Kathleen Drapcho, and Jen Ankney.

Bring notes and journals for Observation Assignment Topics 2 & 3 to class. Assignment is due today.

Class Six Tuesday, October 31st: 3.30 - 6.30 p.m.

Readings for this session: Chapter 3 in Levin & Nolan; Handout on Development

Topic: Understanding Children's behavior and developmentally appropriate practices. Panel of teachers: Cathy Humphrey, Judi Kur, Marcia Heitzmann, Diane Reed, and Rebecca Berry

Class Seven November 29th: 3.30 - 6.30 p.m.

Readings for this session: Handouts on differentiated instruction.

Topic: Organizing and managing the classroom to meet individual needs in group settings Panel of Teachers.

Classroom management plan is due today.

Assessment and Grading

A 93-100	C+ 77-79
A - 90 - 92	C 70-76
B+ 87-89	D 65-70

B 83-86 F < 65
B- 80-82

Policies

We expect you to attend all classes, to be punctual, and to participate in classes enthusiastically. Unexcused absences or repeated lateness will result in a reduced grade. We also expect you to complete all assignments punctually. Late assignments will result in a reduced grade. Assignments should be professional in appearance and free from mechanical errors. Assignments that are deemed unacceptable due to mechanical errors or inappropriate appearance will be redone for a maximum of 50% of the assigned point value.

Statement of Compliance with the Americans' with Disabilities Act of 1990

In order to address the special requests to facilitate learning of any students with disabilities, including those with hearing and sight loss, it is necessary for those students to inform the course instructor who will bring these requests to the attention of the Administrative Assistant.

Assignments

There are five assignments for the course.

A. *Observation Assignment (3 Topics)* **(20 Points)**
For each assignment you should take notes during the observation and retain them so that they are available for discussion later.

Topic 1 - First Week of School Observations and Journal Reflections

Assignment #1-Community Building
Look for: What activities does the teacher use to help the members of the classroom become acquainted with each other and begin to build respect for each other? What do you notice about student response to these activities?
Reflect in your journal- What were your expectations? Did anything surprise you? What were your mentor's thoughts about the success of the activities? How would you adapt these activities for your own use?

Assignment #2-Establishing Routines and Expectations
Look for: What routines and expectations are established the first week of school? How does the teacher begin to establish these routines and expectations? Are opportunities to practice the routines part of the introduction? Are some routines and expectations easier than others to learn?
Reflect in your journal-What aspects contributed to the successful introduction of the

routines and expectations? How would you use what you observed to help you when you are teaching?

Bring these observation notes with you to class on (9/11)
Journal entries are due on this date also.

Topic 2- Comparison of Grade Levels Observations and Journal Entry

Assignment #3- Visit at least three different grade level classrooms.
Look for: Observe similarities and differences in one aspect of classroom management across all three grade levels. (For example-transitions, dealing with challenging behavior, use of feedback, structuring activities etc.)
Reflect in your journal- What area did you choose and why?
What similarities and differences did you observe? Why do you think these similarities and differences occurred?
Date due: October 10th in class

Topic 3 - Management within Special Classes

Assignment #4- Go with your class to at least two different specials.
Look for: What classroom management strategies were used by the special teacher? How did the students respond to these different management techniques?
Reflect in your journal- Were the students' behaviors consistent in all settings? Why do you think they behaved the way they did? Compare the special teachers' approaches to management to those of the classroom teacher. What did you learn about classroom management from these observations?
Date due: October 10th in class

B. Classroom Management Tasks for September-December **(20 Points)**
You are responsible for performing the following tasks and writing a reflection about each experience in your weekly journal.

Week 1 (of school): Greet students in the morning and learn their names. (No Journal)

Week 2: Choose a book and read aloud to the class.

Week 3: Line students up and take to specials.

Week 4: Prepare and take students to lunch.

Week 5: Use nonverbal cues to keep a group on task while the mentor teaches (Review Chapter 7 Levin & Nolan)

Week 6: Read with individual students, noting similarities and differences.

Week 7: Manage dismissal routine.

Week 8: Plan and implement a game for DPA.

Week 9: Observe or participate in parent conferences.

Week 10: Be responsible for three transitions each day.

Week 11: Begin to take on opening responsibilities.

Week 12: Perform all opening responsibilities for at least one day.

Week 13: Experiment with a new management strategy in one of your lessons.

Week 14: Choose one of the above responsibilities in which you feel you have made progress. Reflect in your journal about this progress.

Week 15: Choose one of the above responsibilities in which you feel the need for further progress. Discuss this with a colleague and reflect in your journal.

C. *Case Study of Individual Learner* (20 Points)

The purpose of the case study is to help you become a systematic observer of a child's behavior, to begin to identify and understand what causes a child to behave the way (s)he does, and to learn ways to adapt the classroom environment so that the child can be successful.

Week 1 of the Case Study: (September 11)
Observe all children
In consultation with your mentor, select a child to observe who appears to need individual attention or interventions in order to have a successful school year.

Week 2 and 3 of the Case Study: (September 18 – September 29)
General daily observations: Observe the child for at least five to ten minutes each school day and make brief daily notes that describe specific behaviors which stand out. It is suggested you observe the child during structured and unstructured activities, and in at least four different settings, e.g., large group, small group, specials, DPA, lunch. The more observations made, the more you will learn about the child. Share your observations with your mentor.

Week 4 and 5 of the Case Study: (October 2 - October 13)
* select one behavior to observe further (focus area)
examples - calling out, not finishing assignments, bothering others, wandering around the room, name calling, crying, constant movement, aggression, too quiet, lack of friends, not listening
* in consultation with your mentor determine several interventions that might help the

child be successful
examples include - individual attention, helping child with assignments, giving appropriate praise, close proximity to the teacher, list on child's desk.
* try at least one of your interventions and share the results with your mentor.

Week 6 and 7 of the Case Study: (October 16 - 27)
Write a two-page report that could be used for school planning purposes. Share this draft of your report with your mentor The report should include:
* an introduction to the child which focuses on the child's strengths
* descriptions of behaviors or pattern of behaviors that are interfering with initial school success
* discussion of strategies or interventions that have been tried, by you or your mentor, and other strategies that you suggest.
* brief conclusion

Final Task- Based on your mentor's feedback, revise the report and hand in the revised report **along with** your log of observations to your PDA on or before November 10th.

D. *MANAGEMENT PLAN* (30 Points)

The purpose of this assignment is to enhance your thinking about the ideal learning environment you wish to create when you are in charge of your own classroom. This culminating activity asks you to re-examine the individual components that have been discussed in the course and to synthesize your thinking about classroom management into a useable form for the future. The final project is due **Wednesday, November 29th in class**

***Classroom profiles**
Hypothetically, you are the teacher of a class of 20 students. Choose the grade level and use the characteristics of students from the card simulation to describe the make-up of your class. (Please do not write 20 individual profiles.) As the plan emerges, be sure to consider the developmental characteristics of the children you have described. Each segment of the plan should reflect developmentally appropriate practices.

***Beliefs**
In order to explain your educational beliefs, your task will be to write an opening letter to the parents of your future students. In this letter you need to include:

- brief introduction and background
- statement concerning goals for students / teacher
- management style / expectations
- typical kinds of activities in which children will be involved
- communicating to parents the role you want them to play in your classroom
- ways parents can help children be successful students
- how you and parents will communicate
- closing statement that reflects your belief

***Physical Environment**

Create a visual that shows the physical organization of your classroom. Write a rationale that explains how your classroom is arranged and why.

***Community Building**

Describe how you would go about creating a sense of community within your own classroom.

***Routines and Tools for Classroom Management**

Describe one routine that you will use in your classroom and explain how the children will learn it. Select 3 or 4 tools you value the most. Describe how you will use these tools and how they fit with your current beliefs.

E. CLASS PARTICIPATION **(10 Points)**

Your preparation for and participation in class are important aspects of your involvement in this course. Your contributions to the quality of classroom learning activities influence your own learning as well as that of your colleagues. We expect that you will attend all classes, will come to each class having read the assigned readings carefully, and will participate actively in all learning activities.

Connections to EKED Framework

C & S 405 is linked to the conceptual framework in many ways. The connection is obvious in terms of the node, "Educators manage and monitor learning and development," since this is the central focus of the course. The course also attempts to help interns develop as "lifelong learners' by equipping them with problem solving, observation, and inquiry skills that they can use throughout their professional careers. The "understanding of how students learn and develop" is deepened by the observation assignments which asks interns to observe and compare classroom learning environments at three different grade levels and by the seminar on student development. Though "discipline knowledge" is not the focus of the course, "pedagogical understanding" is deepened through the observation assignments, the individual case study, the final course project, and through the weekly management task assignments. Finally the recognition that interns are "members of multiple learning communities" is brought into focus through the focus on the development of learning communities within the classroom, the school, and the PDS enterprise.

SUMMARY OF DUE DATES FOR ASSIGNMENTS:

Observation Topic 1	9/11
Observation Topics 2 & 3	10/10

Case Study	11/10
Management Plan	11/29
Management Tasks 2 - 15	Weekly Journals 2 - 16

C & S 405
Strategies of Classroom Management
MTWRF 9 - 12 (109 Chambers)

Dr. Jim Nolan
148 Chambers Bldg.
865-6569

Texts: 1) Levin & Nolan (1996) Principles of Classroom Management: A Professional Decision Making Model (2nd Ed.); 2) Brendtro, Brokenleg, & Van Bockern (1990) Reclaiming Youth at Risk

C & S 405 Strategies of Classroom Management

Goals

This course has been designed for both preservice and inservice educators to enable them to become better instructional decision makers by providing a comprehensive understanding of the factors which must be considered in making decisions about classroom management. Specifically as a result of this course students should:

1. Develop a deep understanding of the meaning of classroom management including the relationships of classroom management to teaching, learning, and discipline.

2. Develop an understanding of the various internal and external factors which contribute to students decisions about their behavior in classrooms.

3. Develop an understanding of the impact of student self-esteem on student behavior, the four components of self-esteem, and teacher actions which can lead to enhanced student self-esteem.

4. Develop an understanding of the relationship between teacher philosophical beliefs about management and the actions which teachers can take to establish classroom learning environments.

5. Develop an understanding of the relationship between high quality instruction and student choices about behavior.

6. Develop an understanding of how culture influences school behavior and our interpretations of student and teacher behavior.

7. Develop classroom guidelines and rules which will facilitate positive student choices about behavior.

8. Develop a variety of nonverbal behaviors which can be used to facilitate positive student behavior and remediate inappropriate behavior.

9. Develop a variety of verbal behaviors which can be used to establish positive, assertive communication with students which will facilitate positive student behavior.

10. Develop strategies for using logical and natural consequences to help students make appropriate behavior choices and learn to develop long term control over their own behavior.

11. Develop strategies for working effectively with parents and others to promote positive student behavior.

12. Develop a set of principles concerning classroom management which can be used to construct positive classroom learning environments and to solve the problems which are inherent and inevitable in establishing effective learning environments.

Daily Syllabus

Date	Topic	Reading	Assignment Due
	Section 1	**Foundations**	
5/6	Introduction, Overview, Basic Definitions	Levin and Nolan (L & N) Chapters 1 & 2	
5/7	Understanding Misbehavior	L & N Chapter 3	
5/8	Seeds of Discouragement & The Circle of Courage	Brendtro, Brokenleg and Van Bockern (B, B, & V, 1 - 54) and Packet Part 1	
5/9	Philosophy and Power Bases	L & N, Chapter 4 and Packet Part 2	
5/10	No Class		
5/13	Organizing the Environment	L & N, Chapter 6	Concept Map on Understanding Behavior and Self-esteem
5/14	School and Classroom Observation - Ferguson Township Elementary		
5/15	Basics of Effective Teaching	L & N Chapter 5, 93-107 and Packet Part 3 A & B	
5/16	Beyond the Basics	L & N, Chapter 5, 107-121 and Packet Part 3 D	
5/17	Beyond the Basics: Cooperative Learning	Packet Part 3 C	
5/20	School and Classroom Observation: Ferguson Township Elementary		
5/21	Coping Skills	L & N Chapters 7 & 8	Article Review Due
5/22	Coping Skills	L & N Chapters 7 & 8 and Packet Part 4	

5/23	Solving Chronic Problems	B, B,,& V, Part 3 58 -89 and Packet Part 5	
5/24	Solving Chronic Problems	L & N Chapters 9 & 10	
5/28	Problem Solving and Working with Parents	Packet Part 6	
5/29	Special Needs Students: Dr. Kathy Ruhl		
6/1	Problem Solving	None	
6/2	Problem Solving and Course Wrap Up	None	Final Paper

16

Evaluation of Student Learning

Assignment	Point Value	Due Date
1. Concept Map on Understanding Reasons for Student Behavior	25	5/13
2. Review of Articles on Classroom Management	25	5/21
3. Final Paper	35	5/31
4. Class Attendance, Participation, and Completion of Assigned Readings	15	Ongoing

Grading Scale

A = 93 to 100	B = 83 to 87	C = 70 to 76
A- = 90 to 92	B- = 80 to 82	D = 65 to 69
B+ = 88 to 89	C+ = 77 to 79	F below 65

Guidelines

1. All assignments are due on specified dates
2. Late assignments are reduced by 10% of assignment value
3. Late assignments are due during the next class period
4. Attendance at all classes is expected

Specific Assignments

1. Concept Map on Understanding Behavior and Self-Esteem

Each student will develop a one page (inside of a file folder) concept map or semantic web which illustrates the major concepts from readings, class discussions, and activities regarding reasons underlying why students choose to behave as they do (including self-esteem, basic needs, development, societal factors, etc.) In a one page, double spaced essay the student will provide a brief overview of the map and explain the rationale underlying the construction of the map.

Assessment Criteria

A. Density of the Concept Map (# of key concepts)	6 points
B. Structure of the Map (# of levels and accuracy of the relationships depicted by the map)	10 points
C. Clarity and appropriateness of the map explanation	6 points
D. Professional aspects (appearance of map, appropriate grammar, punctuation, spelling, etc.)	3 points
Total	25 points

2. Review of Classroom Management Articles

Each student will read, summarize and identify the implications of three articles from the professional literature on classroom management. The articles must have been published after 1990 and must relate directly to classroom management issues. At least one of the articles must focus on issues of inclusion and special needs learners. The articles must come from at least two different journals. The review should be divided into two parts. Part one is a brief summary of the major points contained in the article. Part two should accomplish two tasks: 1) Draw out the implications of the article for teachers or other educators; and 2) Relate the article to concepts and topics addressed in this course. **A copy of the article must be attached to the review.**

Assessment Criteria

1. Accuracy of the summary in identifying key points contained in the article.	9 points
2. Implications for teaching context are listed and explained	6 points
4. At least one article deals with inclusion or exceptional learners	3 points
5. Professionalism (appearance, writing clarity, writing mechanics)	4 points
6. A copy of each article is provided	3 points
Total	25 points

3. Final Paper

Assume that you are being interviewed for a teaching job in your field. You have been asked to bring the following written materials to the interview: 1) A list of 7 to 10 principles of classroom management (phrased in your own words) which you see as most important and most valuable; 2) An explanation for each of the principles which explains why that particular principle is so important and valuable as you see it; and 3) At least one concrete description for each principle of how you will put the principle into practice in your classroom. This set of required interview materials will constitute your final paper for this course.

Assessment Criteria

1. A list of 7 - 10 management principles is provided	7 Points
2. Each principle is clearly expressed in the teacher's own words	7 points
3. A clear, defensible explanation is provided for each principle which shows the importance and value of that principle	7 points
4. A concrete, specific example is provided for each principle of how the teacher will put the principle into practice.	7 points
5. The ten principles are coherent and consistent with each other.	4 points
5. Professionalism (appearance, writing clarity, writing mechanics)	3 points
Total	35 points

In order to address the special requests to facilitate learning of any students with disabilities, including those with hearing and sight loss, it is necessary for those students to inform the course instructor who will bring these requests to the attention of the Administrative Assistant.